DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 155 347 CE 016 482

AUTHOR Drucker, Eugene H.
TITLE Changes in Soldier Attitudes.
INSTITUTION Human Resources Research Organization, Alexandria, Va.
SPONS AGENCY Office of the Chief of Research and Development (Army), Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO HumRRO-74-21
PUB DATE Aug 74
CONTRACT DAHC-19-73-C-0004
NOTE 48p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Armed Forces; *Attitudes; *Changing Attitudes; Comparative Analysis; *Enlisted Personnel; Evaluation Needs; Literature Reviews; *Military Service; *Motivation; Research Needs; Surveys
IDENTIFIERS *Army; United States

ABSTRACT

As part of a study for increasing motivation and preventing attitude deterioration among enlisted men, two studies were conducted: (1) to determine the attitudes of soldiers in 1970 (974 basic trainees at Fort Knox) and compare them with those of soldiers similarly questioned between 1945 and 1951; and (2) to review the literature on attitude change, concentrating on the theories of Leon Festinger and Daniel Katz. The areas investigated by the surveys in Part I were morale, training, leadership, organizational efficiency, importance of the Army, military discipline, alienation, satisfaction with services, and concern for the soldier. Useful comparisons between the two groups of responses were drawn, taking into consideration the effects of the following methodological problems: differences in sample composition, outdated phrasing, willingness to respond candidly, influence of one question on another, administration procedures, unit and post differences, and likelihood of combat participation. While certain similarities and differences were identified between the two surveys, the historical comparison showed that overall the attitudes of the soldiers at Fort Dix in 1948 were unusually favorable and merited further examination. Future studies should also include questions dealing with possible major issues of the future and with apprehensions about combat and injury or death. While four approaches to attitude changes (functional, learning, perceptual, and consistency) were recognized in the literature survey of part II, the two theories examined (functional and dissonance) were selected for having the greatest potential for success; but they still require additional research and evaluation before their application. (EIG)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

Technical Report
74-21
HumRRO-TR-74-21

HumRRO

ED155347

Changes in Soldier Attitudes

Eugene H. Drucker

HUMAN RESOURCES RESEARCH ORGANIZATION
300 North Washington Street • Alexandria, Virginia 22314

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.

August 1974

Prepared for

Office of the Chief of Research and Development
Department of the Army
Washington, D.C. 20310

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

CE 016 482

The Human Resources Research Organization (HumRRO) is a nonprofit corporation established in 1969 to conduct research in the field of training and education. It is a continuation of The George Washington University Human Resources Research Office. HumRRO's general purpose is to improve human performance, particularly in organizational settings, through behavioral and social science research, development, and consultation. HumRRO's mission in work performed under Contract DAHC 19-73-C-0004 with the Department of the Army is to conduct research in the fields of training, motivation and leadership.

The contents of this paper are not to be construed as an official Department of the Army position, unless so designated by other authorized documents.

Published
August 1974
by
HUMAN RESOURCES RESEARCH ORGANIZATION
300 North Washington Street
Alexandria, Virginia 22314

Unclassified

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
1. REPORT NUMBER HumRRO-TR-74-21	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO.	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
4. TITLE (and Subtitle) CHANGES IN SOLDIER ATTITUDES		5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED Technical Report
		6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER HumRRO-TR-74-21
7. AUTHOR(S) Eugene H. Drucker		8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(S) DAHC 19-73-C-0004
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS Human Resources Research Organization (HumRRO) 300 North Washington Street Alexandria, Virginia 22314		10. PROGRAM ELEMENT PROJECT TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS Army Project 2Q062107A745
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS Office of the Chief of Research and Development Department of the Army Washington, D.C. 20310		12. REPORT DATE August 1974 13. NUMBER OF PAGES 43
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (if different from Controlling Office)		15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) Unclassified 15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE

16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report)

Approved for public release;
distribution unlimited.

17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)

18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES

Work Unit ESPRIT; Research performed by HumRRO Division No. 2,
Fort Knox, Kentucky

19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)

Attitude Change	Functional Theory
Attitude Surveys	Morale
Attitudes	Motivation
Dissonance Theory	Soldier Attitudes

20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)

As part of a study of methods for increasing motivation and preventing attitude deterioration of the enlisted man, responses to specific items in a 1970 HumRRO attitude survey conducted at Fort Knox were compared with responses to the same items in several surveys conducted by the U.S. Army Troop Attitude Research Branch during and immediately following World War II. Caution must be exercised in making such comparisons since reponses

(Cont.)

DD FORM 1 JAN 73 1473 EDITION OF 1 NOV 65 IS OBSOLETE

Unclassified

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

20. *(Cont.)*

to attitude items can be affected by many factors, including sample composition, outdated phrasing, willingness to respond candidly, influences from other items, administrative procedures, unit or post differences, and likelihood of combat participation. Results of the response comparison suggested several areas of possible similarities and differences in soldier attitudes over the 20 to 25 year period; they also showed how historical comparisons can affect the interpretation of responses to these items. A review of the literature dealing with the process of attitude change gave special attention to the dissonance and functional theories of attitude change for possible implication with reference to changing soldier attitudes.

PREFACE

The research described in this report was performed by the Human Resources Research Organization as part of Work Unit ESPRIT, Development of Methods for Improving Soldier Adjustment to the Army. The objective of Work Unit ESPRIT was to develop measuring instruments for determining the sources of low motivation and attitude deterioration among enlisted men, and to adapt and evaluate methods for increasing motivation and preventing attitude deterioration.

This report, prepared in connection with Work Sub-Unit ESPRIT II, compares responses obtained in HumRRO soldier attitude surveys conducted in 1970 with responses to similar items in surveys administered shortly after World War II. Readers are cautioned against interpreting these 1970 data as comparing the "new" with the "old" Army. Substantial changes have taken place in the Army since 1971, when the Volunteer Army (VOLAR) experiment was initiated at least partially to improve soldier attitudes toward the Army; further, the draft has been discontinued. Also, it should be noted that the 1970 HumRRO survey was conducted at a single Army post and did not necessarily reflect world-wide Army attitudes.

In addition, this report contains a discussion based on a literature survey conducted in Work Sub-Unit ESPRIT IV dealing with attitude change theories and their possible application in efforts to improve soldier motivation.

The research was conducted at HumRRO Division No. 2, Fort Knox, Kentucky, where Dr. Donald F. Haggard is the Director of Research. Eugene H. Drucker was the ESPRIT Work Unit Leader. Personnel of the U.S. Army Armor Human Research Unit provided military support for this effort. LTC Willis G. Pratt is the Unit Chief.

HumRRO research for the Department of the Army under Work Unit ESPRIT was conducted under contract DAHC 19-73-C-0004. Army Training Research is conducted under Army Project 2Q062107A745.

Meredith P. Crawford
President
Human Resources Research Organization

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

PROBLEM

Improvement in the attitudes of soldiers toward the Army is a matter of continuing concern to the Army, since better attitudes can mean increased effectiveness and a more stable and high-morale force. Better understanding of the present attitudes of soldiers, and of changes that have occurred in soldiers' attitudes over time, will provide information on which to base programs for improving conditions of Army life that are important to soldier attitudes and morale.

APPROACH

Responses to attitude items administered during a 1970 HumRRO survey conducted at Fort Knox were compared with replies to the same questions in a number of surveys made by the U.S. Army's Troop Attitude Research Branch of the Troop Information and Education Division 20 to 25 years ago. The nine general subject areas included in the comparison are Morale, Training, Leadership, Organizational Efficiency, Importance of the Army, Military Discipline, Alienation, Satisfaction With Services, and Concern for the Soldier.

An effort was made to identify types of attitude items that appeared to be most productive in presenting a picture of soldier attitudes in historical perspective, for possible inclusion in future questionnaires. An effort was also made to identify new types of items that might be promising for use in future efforts to survey and understand soldier attitudes.

A review of the literature on attitude change theory was performed, exploring concepts that might be a potentially valuable source of methods for attempting to improve soldier attitudes. Special attention was given to dissonance and functional theories of attitude change, and the possibilities of their application in modifying the attitudes of soldiers toward the Army.

FINDINGS

Caution must be exercised in interpreting comparisons because responses to attitude items can be affected by many factors, including sample composition, outdated phrasing, willingness to respond candidly, influences from other questionnaire items, administrative procedures, unit or post differences, and likelihood of combat participation. Nevertheless, comparison of results from items contained in the 1970 survey with responses to the same questions on previous surveys 20 to 25 years ago suggested certain similarities and differences in the attitudes of soldiers toward the Army. Some of these are presented for each subject area. Because of the many factors that can influence responses to attitude items, these comparisons must be treated as suggestive rather than as definitive of the attitude differences that actually existed.

Morale

The percentage of those who reported the morale of their unit as high or very high was approximately the same in the 1945 and 1970 samples, as was the percentage

of those who reported they were usually in good spirits. However, the percentage of those who said they were often worried and upset was higher in the 1970 sample, (40%) than in samples from earlier years (12 to 15%).

There was a sharp decline between the 1948 sample (65%) and the 1970 sample (17%) in soldiers stating that they liked the Army.

In the 1948 sample, 78% of the respondents indicated that they would have a favorable attitude toward the Army on discharge; the figure was 47% in the 1970 sample.

Training

In the 1951 sample, 74% of the subjects thought all the training they were getting was needed; only 27% of the 1970 sample felt this way.

The percentage of trainees who felt they were ready for combat was substantially higher in the 1970 sample than in the 1951 sample.

One-quarter of the 1951 sample felt that the physical training program was too easy; less than a seventh of the 1970 sample agreed.

Leadership

In the 1948 sample, 89% of the subjects felt that all or most of their officers really "knew their stuff"; in the 1970 sample, this proportion was 68%. There was very little difference between the two samples in the percentage of respondents who felt that noncoms knew their stuff.

Evaluations of officers' ability to obtain cooperation from the men fluctuated widely in the different samples.

Organization and Efficiency

A higher percentage of soldiers in the 1970 sample (49%) than in the 1951 sample (36%) felt that they had to spend a lot of time waiting around doing nothing every day or quite often.

Importance of the Army

In two 1948 samples, 70 and 77% of the soldiers never doubted that the United States needed a strong military force; only 41% of the 1970 sample agreed.

In the 1948 sample, about two-thirds of the soldiers felt that other countries probably would not attack if the United States was prepared for war; the proportion in the 1970 sample was 40%.

More than three-quarters of the 1948 sample, and less than half of the 1970 sample, felt that military service should be obligatory.

Military Discipline

A greater percentage of the sample in 1948 (53%) than in 1970 (23%) felt that all Army rules and regulations are necessary, although there was little difference in their opinions of the military control and discipline in their units.

Alienation

A smaller percentage of soldiers in the 1970 sample (14%) would refuse to accept an honorable discharge if one were offered than in the 1946 (29%), 1947 (32%), or 1949 (42%) samples.

In the 1948 sample, 85% of the soldiers felt that it was very important for them to make a good record in the Army. This proportion had declined to 49% in the 1970 sample.

Only 64% of the soldiers in the 1970 sample, compared to 85% in the 1951 sample, felt that what they were going to be doing in the Army was worthwhile.

Satisfaction With Services

Characteristics and location of the sample seemed to be major factors in level of criticism of medical attention and of mess and food facilities in 1970 and two surveys in 1948.

Only one-third of the soldiers in the 1970 sample, compared to two-thirds in both 1948 samples, felt that the Army had done everything it could to provide interesting entertainment for off-duty time.

Concern for the Soldier

Soldiers in one 1948 sample felt that their officers had a great deal of interest in their welfare and personal problems (56%); the proportion of the 1970 sample (15%) was very similar to the percentages in the 1946 (16%) and 1947 (18%) samples.

About 60% of the 1970 sample thought that they would get a "good deal" in the Army; 74% thought this in the 1951 sample.

CONCLUSIONS

(1) Many factors affect the responses made by soldiers to items in attitude surveys. Consequently, comparisons of responses to like questions that are included in surveys administered at different periods of time must be made cautiously, and the similarities and differences in soldier attitudes must be treated as suggestive rather than as definitive. Nevertheless, the information thus gained on similarities and differences in soldier attitudes, when viewed in historical perspective, can assist in interpreting responses to attitude items.

(2) In developing a questionnaire to be used for studying attitudes of soldiers in historical perspective, it is important to try to include some items that are likely to become very important in the future, even if they may currently appear to be of marginal importance.

(3) Although new methods for improving attitudes of soldiers can be derived from theories of attitude change, further research in development and evaluation is required before these methods can be effectively applied.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Introduction 11

Part

I Comparison of Soldier Attitudes Over Time 13

Methodological Difficulties in Comparing Attitudes 13

Comparison of Attitudes Among Soldiers 15

Morale 15

Training 17

Leadership 18

Organizational Efficiency 20

Importance of the Army 20

Military Discipline 21

Alienation 22

Satisfaction With Services 23

Concern for the Soldier 25

Conclusions 25

Attitude Items for Future Questionnaires 27

II Attitude Change Theory 29

Dissonance Theory 30

Functional Theories 31

Conclusions 33

References 37

Appendices

A Troop Attitude Research Branch Attitude Items Used in 1970 and 1971 HumRRO Surveys 39

B Items for Detecting Attitude Change Among Soldiers on Issues of Potential Future Importance 44

C Items Dealing With the Soldier's Concern With Combat, Injury, and Death 46

Changes in Soldier Attitudes

INTRODUCTION

The attitudes of the soldier have been of concern to the Army for a long time. Numerous attitude surveys have been conducted, and many new programs for improving attitudes have been developed. For example, over 100 attitude surveys were conducted by the Troop Attitude Research Branch of the Troop Information and Education Division during World War II and the years immediately following the war. More recently, the Army initiated Project VOLAR as an aspect of the Modern Volunteer Army Program to make the Army a more satisfactory place in which to work, and thereby to improve the attitudes of the soldier.

The large amount of information on the attitudes of soldiers that has been accumulated from these surveys and programs may be useful in the design or evaluation of future programs to improve attitudes. If attitudes during certain types of programs are compared with attitudes during other types of programs, it may be possible to infer which factors have significant effects on attitudes. Unfortunately, there are many difficulties in making such comparisons. One of the most serious stems from the use of unique measuring instruments in each survey. For example, the attitude scales that were used to evaluate Project VOLAR were different from those that had been used to evaluate past programs.

However, many items contained in recent surveys have also been included in prior surveys. In two recent HumRRO surveys (1, 2), for example, the items administered to basic trainees included many that were previously administered to soldiers from 1945 to 1951 by the Troop Attitude Research Branch. Appendix A contains those items used in the HumRRO surveys that were initially administered by the Troop Attitude Research Branch.

Although it may be impractical to compare all the responses made by the soldiers in these different surveys, it is feasible to make comparisons on sample responses over varying periods of time, and to examine the changes in attitudes that have occurred during these periods. Therefore, the major purpose of this report is to compare the responses made by soldiers during one of the recent HumRRO surveys with responses made on the same items by soldiers in past surveys. From these comparisons, examined in historical perspective, a better understanding of attitudes of soldiers can be formulated.

The assumption is generally made that attitudes play a major role in determining the effectiveness of the soldier. When a soldier has a favorable attitude toward the Army, it is presumed that he will perform more effectively than when he has a negative attitude. Attitudes may also affect other aspects of a soldier's behavior. Drucker and Schwartz (3) found, for example, that tank commanders who intend to reenlist have more favorable attitudes toward the Army than those who do not intend to reenlist. Consequently, it would be highly desirable to develop more favorable attitudes among soldiers.

To do this, however, it is necessary to use effective attitude change techniques. Various theories attempting to explain the attitude change process have appeared in the psychological literature. Such conceptualizations represent a potentially valuable source of methods for changing attitudes. While methods suggested by such theories are often difficult to apply because they have a theoretical rather than a practical focus, their potential is great enough that they should be carefully considered. A secondary purpose of this report, therefore, is to examine some of these theories and consider their implications for improving the attitudes of soldiers.

Part I of this report deals with a comparison between the responses of soldiers today and the responses made by soldiers in the past on attitude items selected from prior surveys for possible use in a questionnaire being developed for Work Unit ESPRIT II. Part II of the report is concerned with the possible application of attitude theory for improving attitudes among soldiers, and is based on the review of the attitude change literature performed for ESPRIT IV.

Part I

COMPARISON OF SOLDIER ATTITUDES OVER TIME

METHODOLOGICAL DIFFICULTIES IN COMPARING ATTITUDES

Caution must be used when the responses made by one group of soldiers on an attitude scale are compared to the responses made by another group of soldiers, particularly when the responses are made at two different periods of time. Factors such as those outlined in this section may cause the responses of the two groups to differ. Unless the effects of these factors are understood, improper conclusions could be drawn. Ideally, comparisons should not be made unless it can be demonstrated that these factors had no effects on the responses. Since this is virtually impossible, the best alternative action would be to recognize their effects and to take them into account when interpreting the responses.

Differences in Sample Composition. The composition of two samples of subjects may differ, and this may cause differences in how the two groups will respond to an attitude item. For example, the soldiers in the Army today differ in many important ways from soldiers in the Army during and just after World War II. At that time, black soldiers were segregated from the rest of the Army and were not included in the typical survey conducted by the Troop Attitude Research Branch. In contrast, 9% of the soldiers in the 1970 HumRRO survey were black (1). Differences existed in age, income, education, and marital status, and also in the comparative number of volunteers and draftees in the Army.

Each of these factors could account for some of the differences between the responses made following World War II surveys and the 1970 survey. If the responses during these two periods of time were obtained from soldiers who were alike on all these characteristics, a comparison might lead to conclusions other than those drawn in the following chapter. The differences in responses at various periods of time may not be due to differences in attitude as much as to differences in the backgrounds of the respondents.

Outdated Phrasing. Attitude items can become outdated over a 20- or 30-year period. The language is always changing, and phrases that are common at one period of time may be rarely used at another period. Military terminology is also subject to change; for example, the term "hardening program" is no longer used in the Army, although it appeared in the item, "How do you feel about the physical training and hardening program?" Also somewhat obsolete is the phrase "square deal," which appears in the item, "From what you have seen or heard, do you think you will get a square deal in the Army?" When the meanings of phrases change, or when they become less widely used, it is possible that differences in the responses made by two samples may be due to the wording of the item rather than to differences in the attitude being measured.

Willingness to Respond Candidly. Soldiers may be more willing to admit their true attitudes toward the Army during some periods than during others. Historically, there have been periods during which it was considered undesirable to be critical of the United States or its institutions. During times when patriotism was so highly valued, soldiers who disliked the Army may have falsified their responses to make their attitudes appear more

favorable. More recently, extreme patriotism has become unpopular with many people – criticism of the country and its institutions has even been rewarded in some cases. Respondents during a period of this kind may tend to distort their responses to make their attitudes appear more negative than they really are. Even when the responses are not falsified, the more negative attitude may reflect the social conditions of the civilian society rather than any aspect of the military itself.

Questionnaire Influence on Responses. The responses made to a particular item on a questionnaire may be affected by other items in the questionnaire or by previous questionnaires administered to the same subjects. Dillehay and Jernigan (4) found that administering a biased questionnaire to subjects can change their responses to a nonbiased questionnaire administered later. From this finding, it can be inferred that the responses made to the items toward the end of a questionnaire can be influenced by the items appearing earlier in the same questionnaire. If so, the context in which an item appears in two separate surveys may affect the responses made to that item. Differences in the responses between two groups may be a result of variations in the questionnaires themselves rather than the result of differences in attitudes.

Administration Procedures. The procedures used in administering a questionnaire may also influence the responses made. Some questionnaires are administered anonymously; others require that the respondents identify themselves. Soldiers may be much less willing to admit negative attitudes toward the Army when they are required to include identification information.

Similarly, soldiers may be more candid in expressing their attitudes when the surveys are conducted by nonmilitary personnel rather than by uniformed soldiers. Even the presence of military authority figures during the survey conducted by nonmilitary individuals can affect the responses to attitude items. Very often the NCOs and officers in charge of a unit circulate among the respondents during the administration of a questionnaire. A soldier may be reluctant to indicate negative feelings when an NCO or officer may see his responses. Thus, the responses made during two different surveys may reflect not differences in attitude, but differences in administering the questionnaires.

Occasionally, questionnaires are distributed by mail or by some other means that does not require the soldiers to respond. Often, only a small proportion of respondents who receive questionnaires in this manner do reply. Since the soldiers who do respond may differ in some important ways from soldiers who do not respond, replies to questionnaires administered in this manner may be subject to question. On the other hand, if the questionnaires are administered in a group situation in which the soldier must participate, he may protest by falsifying his responses.

Unit and Post Differences. Differences between Army units may cause the attitudes of soldiers in one unit to differ from the attitudes of those in another. The policies of a unit commander, for example, could result in unusually favorable or unfavorable attitudes among his troops. Similarly, differences may appear among the attitudes of men assigned to different posts, since the policies or conditions at a single post may result in highly favorable or unfavorable attitudes among the men assigned there. At a single point in time there will be differences in the attitudes of men assigned to different squads, platoons, companies, battalions, and posts.

When an attitude survey includes only men assigned to a single unit or a single post, the danger exists that the attitudes of the men surveyed will not be representative of those in the entire Army. Regardless of whether their attitudes are more favorable or less favorable than those of men in other units, a distorted picture would result. For example, the attitudes of the soldiers in the 1948 survey conducted at Fort Dix were much more favorable than those of men tested at any other period of time included in this report. If data were used only from the Fort Dix survey, an unrealistic picture of the enlisted man would emerge.

Caution must therefore be used in comparing the results of surveys in which the subjects were from a single unit or post, since attitudes of these subjects might be quite different from those in the Army as a whole.

Likelihood of Combat Participation. The likelihood that a soldier will participate in combat varies according to circumstances. During some years, it is likely that a soldier will participate in combat or be assigned to a combat zone. During other years, the Army may not be engaged in combat, or the combat itself may be narrow enough in scope that any particular soldier would be relatively unlikely to be assigned to a combat unit. These differences in combat probabilities may affect the responses of the soldiers who complete an attitude survey. Soldiers who feel that they will definitely go into combat may be more critical of training than those who do not feel that they will go into combat. They may also be more critical of their leaders. These effects must be taken into account in interpreting attitude data obtained at two different periods of time.

COMPARISON OF ATTITUDES AMONG SOLDIERS

The attitude comparisons presented in this chapter are made between attitudes of soldiers measured 20-25 years apart. The more recent data were obtained from a HumRRO survey of attitudes of 974 basic trainees at Fort Knox in 1970 (1). The other surveys were conducted by the Troop Attitude Research Branch of the U.S. Army Troop Information and Education Division during World War II and the years immediately following the war. The items are grouped and discussed according to the categories used in the report of the HumRRO survey. Factors such as those discussed in the preceding section will obviously account for some of the differences in responses made during the 20-25 year period. Nevertheless, these comparisons are presented in order to consider whether historical comparison can assist in interpreting responses to attitude items administered to military personnel.

MORALE

Five questions dealing with morale in the 1970 survey were also included in the prior surveys. The most direct of these was the question, "On the whole, how is the morale in your company or detachment?" The data presented here were obtained from Army Ground Forces in 1945 by administering anonymous questionnaires to a cross section of white enlisted men in the continental United States (5). The data show that 46% of the soldiers in the 1970 sample and 39% of the soldiers in the 1945 sample reported their morale to be high or very high. Thus, morale was reported to be high by a slightly higher percentage of men in the 1970 sample than in the 1945 sample. However, the 1970 sample included only basic trainees, while the 1945 sample included a cross section of Army Ground Forces but included no black soldiers.

Other questions were concerned with the respondents' personal morale. "In general, how would you say you feel most of the time, in good spirits or in low spirits?" was an item included in Troop Attitude Research Branch surveys performed in 1946, 1947, and 1949. The 1946 data were obtained from a sample of over 5,000 enlisted men, nine-tenths of whom were volunteers (6). Both the 1947 (7) and 1949 (8) data were obtained from a cross section of white enlisted men that did not include Air Force units. The data show that 43% of the 1970 sample and from 40 to 47% of the subjects in the earlier samples reported that they were usually in good spirits. Thus, there was little change during the 25-year period in the responses to this item.

Morale

On the whole, how is the morale in your company or detachment?

	1970	1945
Very low	9%	12%
Low	15%	15%
Just so-so	30%	34%
High	35%	27%
Very high	11%	12%

In general, how would you say you feel most of the time, in good spirits or in low spirits?

	1970	1946	1947	1949
Usually in good spirits	43%	47%	40%	45%
Sometimes good, sometimes low	40%	42%	44%	43%
Usually in low spirits	17%	11%	13%	11%

Are you ever worried and upset?

	1970	1946	1947	1949
Hardly ever	16%	34%	37%	40%
Sometimes	44%	52%	46%	48%
Often	40%	14%	15%	12%

In general, how do you like the Army?

	1970	1948
Like it all right	17%	65%
Not so bad	40%	31%
Don't like the Army	43%	4%

Do you think when you are discharged you will go back to civilian life with a favorable or unfavorable attitude toward the Army?

	1970	1948
Very favorable	16%	56%
Fairly favorable	31%	22%
About fifty-fifty	31%	18%
Fairly unfavorable	13%	1%
Very unfavorable	9%	3%

Another item, "Are you ever worried and upset?" was administered to the same samples as the two previous items. Here, however, there was a large difference between the response made by the 1970 sample and those responses made by the earlier samples. In 1970, 40% of the sample reported that they were often worried and upset, while only 12 to 15% of the earlier samples reported this.

The question, "In general, how do you like the Army?" was administered in 1948 to samples of volunteer trainees at Fort Dix and Fort Jackson (9). The data presented

here are from enlisted men serving at Fort Dix. In 1948, 65% of the men in the sample reported that they liked the Army; in 1970, only 17% reported that they liked the Army. Thus, there was a very large difference in the responses made to this item between the two samples.

The final morale item was concerned with the soldier's estimate of his attitude upon discharge: "Do you think when you are discharged you will go back to civilian life with a favorable or unfavorable attitude toward the Army?" The item was administered to the same 1948 sample as the previous item. Again, there were large differences in the responses made by subjects of the 1948 and 1970 samples. While 78% of the 1948 sample indicated that they would have very favorable or fairly favorable attitudes on discharge, only 47% of the 1970 sample reported this.

TRAINING

Three of the items dealing with attitudes toward training that were used in the 1970 survey were also used in prior surveys. One dealt with the relevance of the training received: "Do you think that some of the training you have been getting is not needed to make men good soldiers?" In 1951, this item was administered to a sample of men in their sixth week of basic training (10). The sample included men in six-week and 14-week cycles at Training Divisions, and men in organizations other than Training Divisions. The results show a large difference in how the two samples viewed the relevance of training. In 1951, 74% of the subjects indicated that all training was needed, while only 27% of the 1970 subjects thought this.

Training

Do you think that some of the training you have been getting is not needed to make men good soldiers?

	1970	1951
Much is not needed	16%	3%
Some is not needed	57%	23%
All is needed	27%	74%

Do you feel that you are trained and ready for combat or do you need more training?

	1970	1951
Ready now	17%	5%
Need a little more	37%	29%
Need a lot more	46%	66%

How do you feel about the physical training and hardening program?

	1970	1951
Too easy	15%	25%
About right	72%	68%
Too hard	13%	7%

Another item was concerned with the perceived need for additional training: "Do you feel that you are trained and ready for combat or do you need more training?" This item was administered to the same 1951 sample. From a comparison of the 1951 and 1970 responses, it appeared that a greater proportion of trainees felt that they were ready for combat in 1970 than in 1951. In 1951, 66% of the subjects felt that they needed a lot more training, while in 1970, only 46% felt this.

The final item—"How do you feel about the physical training and hardening program?"—was also administered to the same 1951 sample. Although the responses made by the two samples were quite similar, a greater proportion of the 1951 sample felt that physical training was too easy.

In summary, more soldiers in the 1970 sample seemed to feel that some of their training was unnecessary, but this was accompanied by a tendency in 1970 for the soldiers to feel that they were ready for combat or that they only needed a little more training. A majority of the 1951 sample indicated they felt that they needed a lot more training.

LEADERSHIP

Four of the attitude items pertaining to leadership in the 1970 survey had been included in earlier surveys. Three of these items were concerned with reactions to officers. The item "Do you feel that the officers who are in charge of your work really know their stuff?" was administered in 1948 to the Fort Dix sample previously described (9). The data show a substantial difference in the responses obtained at the two different periods of time. In 1948, 57% of the soldiers felt that all officers "really know their stuff," while only 21% of the soldiers in the 1970 sample felt this. On the other hand, 47% of the soldiers in the 1970 sample felt that most officers "know their stuff," while 32% of the soldiers in the 1948 sample felt this. Thus, in 1948, a majority of the subjects held high regard for all their officers. Although close to half the 1970 sample held high regard for most officers, there was a greater tendency to be critical of certain officers in 1970 than in 1948.

Another item asked, "How successful are your officers in getting willing and wholehearted cooperation from their men?" This question was asked in five different surveys conducted by the Troop Attitude Research Branch. The 1945 sample included a cross section of white enlisted men in the continental United States (5); the 1946 survey included a sample of over 5,000 enlisted men, most of whom were volunteers (6); the 1947 survey included over 3,000 white enlisted men who had completed basic training (7); the 1948 survey was taken of enlisted men serving at Fort Dix (9); the 1949 survey was a cross section of over 1,000 white enlisted men in the United States (8).

The data show that evaluations of officers on this item fluctuated widely at these different periods. Officers were described most favorably in the 1948 sample, and least favorably in the 1946 and 1947 samples. In 1970, 32% of the soldiers reported that officers were very successful in getting wholehearted cooperation from their men; during the period from 1945 to 1949, from 20 to 51% of the soldiers indicated this. Only 4% of the 1970 sample reported that officers were unsuccessful in getting cooperation, but 11% of the 1947 sample reported this.

The final question pertaining to officers was, "When the officers you work for give you something to do, do they tell you enough about it so that you can do a good job?" This item was administered in 1948 to the Fort Dix sample (9). Again, the 1948 sample was much more favorable in their responses than the 1970 sample. In 1948, 54% of the men indicated that their officers always told them enough, while in 1970, only 13% of the men indicated this.

Leadership

Do you feel that the officers who are in charge of your work really know their stuff?

	1970	1948
All do	21%	57%
Most do	47%	32%
About half do	21%	5%
Few do	8%	4%
None do	3%	2%

How successful are your officers in getting willing and wholehearted cooperation from their men?

	1970	1945	1946	1947	1948	1949
Very	32%	34%	22%	20%	51%	31%
Fairly	51%	52%	53%	41%	38%	49%
Not very	13%	12%	20%	25%	8%	16%
Unsuccessful	4%	2%	5%	11%	3%	4%

When the officers you work for give you something to do, do they tell you enough about it so that you can do a good job?

	1970	1948
Always do	13%	54%
Usually do	49%	33%
Often do not	28%	10%
Almost never	10%	3%

Do you feel that the noncoms in the cadre in charge of your work really know their stuff?

	1970	1948
All do	14%	21%
Most do	46%	44%
About half do	24%	15%
Few do	13%	15%
None do	3%	5%

One of the questions in the HumRRO survey stated, "Do you feel that the noncoms in the cadre in charge of your work really know their stuff?" This item was also administered in the 1948 survey at Fort Dix (9). In general, the responses made in the 1948 survey correspond closely to the responses made in the 1970 survey. In 1948, 65% of the soldiers in the sample replied that all or most noncoms know their stuff; in 1970, 60% of the soldiers in the sample indicated this.

In summary, there were wide fluctuations in responses to the questions that had been given repeatedly from 1945 to 1949. The responses made in the 1970 sample were quite similar to those made in the 1945 and 1949 samples, but rather different from those made in the 1946, 1947, and 1948 samples. The 1948 Fort Dix sample described their officers much more favorably than they were described by the soldiers in the 1970

sample, but there was virtually no difference between the 1948 and 1970 samples in their descriptions of NCOs.

ORGANIZATIONAL EFFICIENCY

One item dealing with organizational efficiency in the HumRRO survey was included in earlier surveys: "During training and drill periods, do you have to spend much time waiting around and doing nothing?" It was administered in 1951 to basic trainees in their sixth week of training in a six-week or 14-week cycle, and in organizations other than training divisions. A higher percentage of soldiers in the 1970 sample than in the 1951 sample complained about having to wait around. In 1970, 49% of the soldiers in the sample replied that they waited around every day or quite often, while only 36% of the soldiers in the 1951 sample had indicated this.

Organizational Efficiency

During training and drill periods, do you have to spend much time waiting around and doing nothing?

	1970	1951
Yes, every day or quite often	49%	36%
No, not often or never	46%	59%
Undecided	5%	5%

IMPORTANCE OF THE ARMY

Three items in the 1970 sample dealing with the perceived importance of the Army had been included in prior surveys. One of these items was concerned with the need to have a powerful Army: "Do you ever have doubts that the United States needs a strong military force?" This question was asked of a sample of 18-year-old one-year recruits at the end of their basic training during September 1948 (11) and to over 2,000 longer-term trainees in October 1948 (12). The data show a substantial difference between the 1970 sample and the 1948 samples in their perceived need for a strong military force. In 1948, 70% of the soldiers in one survey and 77% in the other survey reported that they never had any doubts about our need for a strong military force. In contrast, only 41% of the soldiers in the 1970 sample reported this. Thus, during the 22-year interim, there appeared to be a reduction in the perceived need for a large Army.

Another item was concerned with preparation for war. It stated, "If the United States is prepared for war, other countries will probably not attack us." This item was administered to the sample of 18-year-old one-year recruits just described (11). Again there was a large difference between the responses made to this item in 1970 and in 1948. In 1948, 64% of the sample reported that other countries would not attack us if the United States were prepared for war. In 1970, however, only 40% of the sample reported this. Thus, preparation for war was seen as a better deterrent for war in 1948 than it was in 1970.

The final question was concerned with the obligation for military service. It stated, "Every able-bodied man in the United States owes it to his country to take military or

Importance of the Army

Do you ever have doubts that the United States needs a strong military force?

	1970	Sept. 1948	Oct. 1948
Never	41%	70%	77%
Sometimes	40%	24%	16%
Often	19%	6%	7%

If the United States is prepared for war, other countries will probably not attack us.

	1970	1948
Agree	40%	64%
Disagree	38%	23%
No opinion	22%	13%

Every able-bodied man in the United States owes it to his country to take military or naval training so that he can protect his country in an emergency.

	1970	1948
Agree	49%	78%
Disagree	30%	12%
No opinion	21%	10%

naval training so that he can protect his country in an emergency." Like the preceding item, this was one of the questions administered to a sample of 18-year-old one-year recruits in 1948 (11). Once again, there was a substantial difference between the responses made by the two samples to this item. In 1948, 78% of the sample felt that every able-bodied man should be required to take military training. In 1970, however, only 49% of the men felt this.

In summary, compared to the 1948 sample, soldiers in the 1970 sample had more doubts about the necessity for having a large Armed Force. Less than half the subjects felt that a well-prepared military would act as a deterrent to war, and more soldiers were beginning to feel that military service should not be obligatory.

MILITARY DISCIPLINE

Two items in the 1970 survey concerned with military discipline were also included in earlier surveys. "What is your opinion of Army rules and regulations?" was asked in the 1948 survey of trainees at Fort Dix (9). Of this sample, 53% indicated that they felt that all rules and regulations in the Army were necessary; only 23% of the 1970 sample agreed. However, more than half the 1970 sample indicated that most rules and regulations were necessary. It appears, therefore, that the 1970 soldiers were not against Army rules and regulations, but were critical of certain ones.

There was little difference in the responses made by the soldiers in the 1970 and 1948 samples to the other item: "What do you think of the military control and discipline in this unit?" About two-thirds of the soldiers in both surveys felt that the control and discipline in their units were "about right."

Military Discipline

What is your opinion of Army rules and regulations?

	1970	1948
All are necessary	23%	53%
Most are necessary	57%	40%
A few are necessary	17%	5%
None are necessary	3%	2%

What do you think of the military control and discipline in this unit?

	1970	1948
Too strict	19%	14%
About right	63%	67%
Not strict enough	18%	19%

ALIENATION

Three of the items in the 1970 survey dealing with alienation had been included in earlier surveys. One was concerned with the degree to which the men felt that they were part of the Army: "If you were offered an honorable discharge today, would you take it?" This question was asked of more than 5,000 enlisted men in the 1946 survey (6) and was included in the 1947 (7) and 1949 (8) surveys of white enlisted men. The data show that the proportion of soldiers who would refuse to accept an honorable discharge was lower in 1970 than in any of the other three years. The highest percentage of soldiers who would refuse to accept such a discharge was in 1949, when 42% of the sample indicated they would not accept an honorable discharge if one were offered. The largest proportion who indicated that they *would* accept an honorable discharge, regardless of whether they could get a job, was in 1946, when 45% indicated that they would accept the discharge under these conditions. In 1970, 40% of the soldiers indicated that they would accept an honorable discharge under any conditions. Only 25% indicated this in 1949.

The desire to do a good job was the subject of another question: "How important is it to you personally to make a good record in the Army?" This item was included in a questionnaire administered to over 5,000 enlisted men representing a cross section of white enlisted men in 1946 (6). There was a major difference in the responses to this item made at the two different periods. In 1948, 85% of the soldiers felt that it was very important for them to make a good record in the Army, while only 49% of the soldiers indicated this degree of importance in 1970. Similarly, a greater proportion of soldiers in 1970 than in 1946 indicated that it was not so important to them to make a good record in the Army.

The importance of military service was the topic of the final item: "Do you feel that what you will be doing in the Army will be worthwhile or not?" This item was included in a 1951 survey of over 2,000 enlisted men (draftees) in their sixth week of basic training (13). In 1951, 85% of the soldiers in the sample felt that their contributions in the Army would be worthwhile, while only 64% of the soldiers in the 1970 sample indicated this.

Alienation

If you were offered an honorable discharge today, would you take it?

	1970	1946	1947	1949
No	14%	29%	32%	42%
Only if I could get a job	15%	8%	11%	14%
Not sure	22%	11%	17%	15%
If I could get any kind of job	9%	5%	4%	3%
No matter what	40%	45%	33%	25%

How important is it to you personally to make a good record in the Army?

	1970	1946
Very important	49%	85%
Fairly important	28%	10%
Not so important	14%	5%
Not important at all	9%	0%

Do you feel that what you will be doing in the Army will be worthwhile or not?

	1970	1951
Certain it will be	24%	29%
Think it will be	40%	56%
Don't think it will be	25%	12%
Certain it won't be	11%	3%

In summary, the soldiers in the 1970 sample appeared to be more alienated from the Army than soldiers were in past samples. The soldier in 1970 was more willing to accept a discharge, less concerned about making a good record in the Army, and more likely to view his work in the Army as not being worthwhile.

SATISFACTION WITH SERVICES

Three of the items in the 1970 questionnaire and prior surveys pertained to attitudes toward services that the Army normally provides. One of these items—"How good is the medical attention given the men in this unit?"—was administered in April 1948 to soldiers who had completed basic training at Fort Dix (9), and in September 1948 to 18-year-old one-year Army recruits near the end of basic combat training at three different Army posts (11). The responses made by soldiers in the 1970 sample were much more similar to the responses made by soldiers in the September 1948 sample than to those made by the April 1948 sample. In April 1948, 53% of the soldiers in the sample reported that they received very good medical attention, while only 27% of the soldiers in the September 1948 sample and 16% of the soldiers in the 1970 sample reported this. The percentage of the soldiers who reported that their medical attention was fairly good was identical in the 1970 and September 1948 samples. Fewer soldiers were critical of their medical attention in April 1948 than at either of the other two times.

Satisfaction With Services

How good is the medical attention given the men in this unit?

	1970	April 1948	Sept. 1948
Very good	16%	53%	27%
Fairly good	41%	29%	41%
Not so good	27%	12%	21%
No good at all	16%	6%	11%

How good are the mess and food facilities at this unit?

	1970	April 1948	Sept. 1948
Very good	14%	18%	32%
Fairly good	50%	40%	44%
Not so good	25%	25%	17%
No good at all	11%	17%	7%

Do you think the Army has done everything it could to provide interesting and entertaining things for the men in this unit to do in their off-duty free time?

	1970	April 1948	Sept. 1948
Yes	35%	66%	69%
No	65%	34%	31%

The same three samples were also administered an item about food facilities: "How good are the mess and food facilities at this unit?" The responses by the 1970 sample were much more like the April 1948 sample than like the September 1948 sample. While 32% of the September 1948 sample felt that their food facilities were very good, only 18% of the April 1948 sample and 14% of the 1970 sample felt this. In September 1948, only 24% of the soldiers in the sample reported that mess and food facilities were either not so good or not good at all. In contrast, 36% of the soldiers in the 1970 sample and 42% of those in the April 1948 sample made these critical reports.

The three samples were also asked about the Army's efforts to provide entertainment for the soldier: "Do you think the Army has done everything it could to provide interesting and entertaining things for the men in this unit to do in their off-duty free time?" About two-thirds of the soldiers in both 1948 surveys felt that the Army did everything it could to provide entertainment, but only one-third of the soldiers in the 1970 survey made this response.

In summary, the characteristics or location of the sample appeared to be as important in determining responses as the time of the surveys. Except on the item dealing with entertainment, different conclusions would be reached by comparing the 1970 sample with the April 1948 sample or with the September 1948 sample. It would appear that the soldier in 1970 was no more critical of the medical attention he received than the soldier in September 1948—but much more critical than the soldier of April 1948. Similarly, the soldier in 1970 would appear to be no more dissatisfied with food

facilities than soldiers have been in the past if compared with the April 1948 sample—but much more dissatisfied if compared with the September 1948 sample.

CONCERN FOR THE SOLDIER

Two items in the 1970 survey dealing with the Army's perceived concern for the soldier had been included in previous surveys. One item was about the officers' concern for the enlisted man: "Do you feel that your officers are interested in your welfare and personal problems?" This item was administered to the 1946 (6), 1947 (7), and 1949 (8) samples and to the 1948 sample at Fort Dix (9). Only in 1948 did a majority of the soldiers surveyed feel that their officers had a great deal of interest in their welfare and personal problems, although a majority of the soldiers in all four samples did feel that officers had at least a fair amount of interest. About 43% of the soldiers in the 1946, 1947, and 1970 samples believed that their officers had little or no interest in their welfare and personal problems. In 1948, only 15% of the soldiers in the sample felt that officers had little or no interest; the proportion had doubled (31%) in 1949.

The second item asked: "From what you have seen or heard, do you think you will get a square deal in the Army?" This item was administered in 1951 to draftees in their sixth week of basic combat training (13). Although a majority of the 1970 sample expected to receive "a square deal," an even greater proportion of the 1951 sample expected this. In 1970, 40% of the soldiers in the sample did not expect to receive a fair deal from the Army; in 1951 only 26% did not.

Concern for the Soldier

Do you feel that your officers are interested in your welfare and personal problems?

	1970	1946	1947	1948	1949
A great deal of interest	15%	16%	18%	56%	25%
A fair amount of interest	43%	41%	36%	29%	43%
Not much interest	30%	29%	27%	7%	22%
No interest at all	12%	14%	16%	8%	9%

From what you have seen or heard, do you think you will get a square deal in the Army?

	1970	1951
Sure I will	11%	8%
Think I will	49%	66%
Don't think I will	30%	22%
Sure I will not	10%	4%

CONCLUSIONS

The comparison of responses made to attitude items during a 20- to 25-year period showed important differences in the composition of the various samples. Data collected during the 1940s were obtained exclusively from white enlisted men, while 9% of the soldiers in the 1970 sample were black. Although it is unlikely that the differing

responses were due exclusively to differences in race, it is possible that sample differences in other personal characteristics, such as age, education, and social class, could have contributed to the varying responses.

Also, while the phrasing in most items was not outdated, some of the differences in response could have resulted from differences in willingness to respond candidly. By 1970, there was an increasing tendency among many people to be highly critical of the society in general and of the Army in particular. Thus, the responses made by some of the soldiers in the 1970 sample may have reflected this propensity toward criticism.

Since the questionnaires used in the surveys appeared to be unbiased, it is unlikely that the differences in response resulted from the nature of the questionnaires themselves. They might, however, have been influenced by the different procedures used to administer the questionnaires. The questionnaire in the 1970 survey was administered by civilians, while the questionnaires in the earlier surveys were administered by military personnel. Furthermore, the soldiers in the 1970 survey were required to state their names and service numbers, while the earlier surveys were administered anonymously. Although the use of civilian administrators during the 1970 survey would probably have increased the willingness to be critical of the Army, the requirement for identification would have had the opposite effect. This makes it difficult to determine how the differences in administrative procedures could have affected the comparisons.

Post differences could also have caused some of the differences in response. The questionnaire in the 1970 survey was administered to basic trainees in five companies at Fort Knox. On the other hand, the questionnaires used in the 1946, 1947, and 1949 surveys were administered to a cross-section of the Army. Thus, some of the differences in response between the 1970 sample and the 1946, 1947, and 1949 samples could have been caused by factors that were unique to Fort Knox during 1970. The significance of post differences was also shown by the 1948 survey conducted at Fort Dix, in which the attitudes of the soldiers were consistently more favorable than those of soldiers in any of the other samples, regardless of when these other surveys were conducted.

Finally, some of the differences in response could have resulted from the conduct of the war in Vietnam. Since many of the soldiers in the 1970 sample were very likely to participate in combat, they could have been more critical of the training they were receiving. The anti-war sentiments present during 1970 may also have caused many soldiers in the sample to be especially critical of the Army.

Despite the influences of these factors on the responses made during the various attitude surveys, certain similarities and differences can be identified among the samples. While these similarities and differences certainly reflect the influence of non-attitudinal factors, it is unlikely that they reflect only these influences. If non-attitudinal factors alone determined responses to attitude items, there would be little value in obtaining attitudinal data. Although the responses to attitude items may not correspond precisely to the attitudes of soldiers, they are, nevertheless, the best available estimates of these attitudes. In short, it is important to compare the responses made by soldiers during these various surveys, while recognizing that the similarities and differences are also caused in part from non-attitudinal factors.

The responses made in 1970 to some of the items dealing with morale were similar to responses made in other years. In both 1945 and 1970, for example, about one-fourth of the soldiers described the morale in their units as low; in 1946, 1947, 1949, and 1970, somewhat over half the soldiers indicated that they were in low spirits at least some of the time. The responses made to some of the leadership items in 1970 were similar to the responses made in 1945, 1948, and 1949. For example, over 80% of the soldiers during those years felt that officers were successful in getting their men to cooperate. Almost two-thirds of the soldiers in 1948 and 1970 felt that most or all noncoms were knowledgeable.

On the other hand, the responses made to other items during 1970 were different from those made during previous years. As an example, more than eight out of ten soldiers in 1970 reported that they were worried and upset at least some of the time, while just two out of three reported this in the 1946, 1947, and 1949 surveys. Only one-sixth of the soldiers in 1970 stated that they liked the Army, compared to two-thirds in 1948. There were differences also in evaluations of training. Only one-fourth of the soldiers in 1970 felt that all their training was needed, while three-fourths felt this in 1951. Differences also appeared on items dealing with organizational efficiency, the perceived importance of the Army, alienation, satisfaction with services, and other areas.

Despite the effects of non-attitudinal factors on these comparisons, presentation of the data in historical perspective made certain attitudes more meaningful than they would otherwise have been. For example, three-fourths of the soldiers in 1970 indicated that it was at least fairly important for them to make a good record in the Army. At first glance, this would appear to indicate that the soldier in 1970 was highly motivated to perform well. However, when compared with 1946, when 95% of the soldiers responded that it was important for them to make a good record in the Army, it is possible that the motivation of the soldier in 1970, although high, may have decreased over time. Additional information on the motivation of the soldier in 1970 was suggested by examining specific responses. For example, although three-fourths of the soldiers in 1970 felt that it was important for them to make a good record in the Army, only half of the soldiers felt that it was very important, whereas 85% of the soldiers surveyed in 1946 felt that it was very important for them to make a good record. Thus, a larger percentage of soldiers appeared highly motivated in 1946 and the degree of their motivation was greater. This suggests that, while information from a single survey can portray the attitudes of the soldier at the time of the survey, historical comparisons can refine this portrayal by providing frames of reference. Such conclusions must be made cautiously, however, and must be treated only as suggestive, with allowances made for the fact that both attitudinal and non-attitudinal factors affected the responses made by soldiers during these different periods.

The historical comparison also showed that the attitudes of the soldier assigned to Fort Dix in 1948 were unusually favorable. Not only was morale higher, the soldier at Fort Dix also had more confidence in his leaders, was more accepting of discipline, was highly confident of the medical attention he was receiving, and felt that officers had great concern for their men. Thus, the data suggest that a closer examination of the situation at Fort Dix could possibly reveal useful information for improving the attitudes of soldiers in the future.

ATTITUDE ITEMS FOR FUTURE QUESTIONNAIRES

In developing a questionnaire to be used for studying attitudes of soldiers in historical perspective, it is important to include some items for issues that are likely to be important in the future, even if they are currently unimportant. By including such items before they do become important issues, attitudes can be assessed as they develop. It is often difficult to predict in advance what issues are going to attain importance—many attitudes measured in a questionnaire may never develop into important issues. Nevertheless, a few of these issues will become important and if they have been included in a questionnaire in advance, valuable information may be provided for interpreting attitudes at the future date.

Several items of this nature were written for the questionnaires administered during Work Unit ESPRIT (1, 2). These items are contained in Appendix B.

Despite the fact that many questionnaires have been used for studying the attitudes of the soldier, very few items in these surveys, if any, deal with the soldier's concern with combat or fear of injury or death. Since these concerns and fears are paramount during periods of war, questions on them should be included in any survey that attempts to formulate a comprehensive portrayal of the attitudes of soldiers. Items dealing with such concerns and fears were written for the ESPRIT study conducted during 1971 (2) and are contained in Appendix C.

Part II

ATTITUDE CHANGE THEORY

The research reported in Part I, comparing soldier attitudes in the 1940s with those in the 1970s, showed a large number of differences. These differences reflect major changes in the social, international, national, cultural, and Army environment, including factors such as the state of the economy, average educational level, and war involvement. So many changes have occurred during the 20-odd years that unravelling how each may have affected those differences is virtually impossible.

In general, one may view attitudes as being influenced by two types of factors—societal and nonsocietal. Since it is difficult, if not impossible, to change attitudes by changing societal factors, the attitudes of soldiers toward the Army can be changed more readily by influencing nonsocietal factors.

A basis for developing strategies for changing nonsocietal factors to improve the attitudes of soldiers is the attitude change literature. Various theories have been advanced in the psychological literature to explain the process of attitude change. Each theory represents a potentially valuable source of ideas on ways of changing attitudes, but the application of each theory is often difficult because theories do not normally take practical considerations into account. Nevertheless, because they are at least potentially useful, it is important to explore their possible implications for improving the attitudes of soldiers. To help explain each theory of attitude change, illustrations of method—many of them derived from the literature reviewing attitude change—are included; these are intended as clarification of the concepts, *not* as practical proposals.

A review of the attitude change literature indicated the existence of four general approaches to attitude change. The functional approach as used by Smith, Bruner, and White (14), Katz (15), and Kelman (16) emphasized the various functions served by attitudes in satisfying human needs. The learning approach as used by Hovland, Janis, and Kelley (17), Doob (18), and Lott and Lott (19) emphasized the role of learning and applied the principles of human learning to attitude formation and change. The perceptual approach as used by Asch (20) and Sherif and Sherif (21) emphasized the role of perception in attitude change and assumed that attitudes change when the object of the attitude becomes redefined or reinterpreted. Finally, the consistency approach as used by Heider (22), Abelson and Rosenberg (23), and Festinger (24) emphasized the individual's need for consistency between attitudes, between cognitions, or between cognitions and affect, and assumed that attitude change occurs as a means of maintaining or restoring consistency.

Although all four approaches can serve as the basis for developing programs to improve the attitudes of soldiers, the functional and consistency approaches appeared to have the greatest potential for success. Consequently, one theory using each approach was selected for detailed examination. Katz's functional theory (15) was selected from among the different functional theories since it appeared to be the most highly developed of these theories, while Festinger's dissonance theory (24) was selected from among the different consistency theories since it has received a great deal of empirical support in the laboratory.

DISSONANCE THEORY

Dissonance theory, formulated by Festinger (24) in 1957, is concerned with the relationship between cognitive elements—those knowledges, beliefs, and opinions that people have about each other or about things in their environment. According to this theory, people strive to maintain consistency between these different elements. When inconsistency develops, dissonance is said to occur. The individual is then motivated to reduce the dissonance—because it produces tension—and to restore the state of consistency that existed previously.

Attitude change is one method that people use to reduce dissonance when it occurs. When dissonance is aroused because a person acts in a way that contradicts his attitudes, consistency can be restored if he changes his attitudes. It can also be restored in other ways—for example, the person may convince himself that his behavior had nothing to do with his attitudes.

Two major problems occur when attempting to use dissonance theory for changing the attitudes of others. First, some practical means must be formulated to arouse dissonance and thus provide an opportunity for influencing attitudes. This can be accomplished by inducing a person to act in a way that contradicts his own attitudes. Two different techniques have been used in laboratory studies to accomplish this objective. In the forced compliance technique, the subject is offered a reward or incentive for complying with a request, usually made in a manner that makes it very difficult for him to refuse to comply. It is important that he feel that he complied of his own volition (25). Generally, the smaller the incentive needed for compliance, the greater the attitude change because more dissonance would be aroused when a person acts contrary to his attitudes to receive a small reward rather than a large reward. Thus, the greatest amount of attitude change would be expected to occur when the smallest possible incentive is used to induce the person to comply with the request.

The other technique that has been used to induce dissonance is to require the subject to choose from a number of alternatives. For example, subjects have been offered their choice of one of several different objects, each of which has both favorable and unfavorable characteristics. Thus, when a subject selects a favored object, it has some negative characteristics, while the unfavored unselected objects have some positive characteristics. One way for the subject to reduce the dissonance that results from his selection would be to change his attitude toward the object he chose—that is, to become even more favorable toward it.

The second major problem in applying dissonance theory to change attitudes is to ensure that dissonance is reduced by attitude change rather than by some other means. In laboratory studies this has been accomplished by structuring the situation so that other means of dissonance reduction are unlikely. In nonlaboratory situations, however, a person may be more likely to resort to some other technique to reduce dissonance. For example, if he has acted in a way that contradicts his attitudes, he may attempt to obtain new information that could "justify" his action, so he can reduce dissonance without changing his attitudes.

Using techniques suggested by dissonance theory to try to change the attitudes of soldiers toward the Army would pose obvious problems, particularly in selecting a method to induce the soldier to act in a more favorable manner. The method selected would have to be ethically proper but, at the same time, it should not be immediately obvious to the soldier.

One method that is often used in high school or college requires students to write essays or to debate, advocating a position opposing their own attitudes, and thus opening up the question of possible change. This can easily be done in English composition or public speaking courses, but it would hardly fit the Army setting.

One intriguing possibility for having soldiers describe the Army in a favorable light could be to use soldiers as Army representatives at fairs and other public displays and programs. Soldiers could be selected to supervise these displays and to present the Army's position to members of the general public. To have the most potential benefit on attitudes, displays would need to be manned not by soldiers with favorable attitudes toward the Army, but by soldiers with unfavorable attitudes! By selecting for such assignments only soldiers the Army wishes most to retain, the method might be useful.

A means for inducing soldiers to write material favorable to the Army would be to tell them that the Army is trying to learn what soldiers like best about the Army. They would be told that this information is necessary if the Army is to be improved in the future. It is important that they be given the choice of writing favorable or unfavorable descriptions but, to induce them to write favorable material, they would be told that there are already enough negative descriptions, and that it would be particularly helpful to have information about good points which the soldiers would like to see enlarged or enhanced.

The forced-choice method for inducing actions is best applied by requiring the soldier to make as many choices as possible, including choices of assignments and training. If he is completely free to choose among several different alternatives, dissonance will be aroused because of the unfavorable aspects of the alternative he selects. One way he could justify the decision would be to develop a more positive attitude toward the chosen alternative. While the technique may not make the soldier's attitude toward the Army more favorable as a whole, it could make his attitude toward his assignment or job more favorable.

In summary, dissonance theory offers many problems for providing a practical basis for changing attitudes. While workable change strategies could be derived from the theory, it remains to be determined whether they would be effective in changing the attitudes of soldiers. The strict experimental control that is available in a psychological laboratory setting is not available in an Army or other real-world setting.

FUNCTIONAL THEORIES

The functional theories of attitude assume that an attitude serves an important function for the individual who holds it. If the particular function can be identified, this information can be used to devise an effective method for changing the attitude. Since the same attitude may serve a different function in different people, no single method of attitude change can be presumed to be effective on all persons. For example, many soldiers may have negative attitudes toward the Army, but the function served by this attitude will vary from soldier to soldier. By identifying the function that the attitude serves for each soldier, the most efficient method could be devised to change the attitude of that individual soldier.

Functional theories of attitude were formulated by Smith, Bruner, and White (14), Katz (15), and Kelman (16). The Katz theory will be discussed in this report as being representative of the group. Katz suggests that attitudes serve four different functions. One, the *adjustment* function, is based upon the proposition that people try to maximize their rewards and minimize their costs. Some attitudes, according to Katz, allow the person to accomplish these objectives. For example, a person who wants to be accepted by a group of his peers may adopt the attitudes of the group as his own, in order to increase his chances of being accepted. If his peers have liberal attitudes, he will be likely to develop liberal attitudes of his own; if they are conservative, he would be likely to develop similar attitudes. Such attitudes are developed as a means of gaining acceptance, and are not derived from the person's reactions to the object of the attitude itself.

A second function is the *ego-defensive*, which protects the person's self-image. Like attitudes serving an adjustment function, ego-defensive attitudes are not derived as a result of experience with the attitude object. Instead, they develop from the inner psychological needs of the person. Without these protective, ego-defensive attitudes, the person might be aware of disturbing elements in himself. Since this might be extremely painful, he develops attitudes that can protect him by keeping such characteristics unconscious—that is, these attitudes allow him to maintain an acceptable self-image. Thus, individuals often develop attitudes or complete ideologies in order to protect themselves from their own weaknesses.

A third function of attitude is the *value-expressive* function. These are attitudes that give an individual a self-concept or a sense of identity and allow him to express himself in a way that reflects his self-image.

Finally, some attitudes serve a *knowledge* function. Many people have a desire to understand the world and to give it meaning. They especially try to understand the part of their environment that is important to them.

A soldier's attitude may serve any one of these functions, or a combination. For example, a soldier may like the Army or dislike the Army not because of any experience he has had with military life, but because his attitude allows him to receive certain rewards or avoid certain penalties. If the soldier wishes to be socially accepted by a group of his peers who believe that the Army is a good place, he may develop a favorable attitude toward the Army. On the other hand, if he wishes to gain acceptance by peers who dislike the Army, he may also dislike it. To influence attitudes serving this function, it would be necessary to convince the soldier that his personal needs could be better served by having a favorable attitude toward the Army. Advertising campaigns, for example, can stress that employers hire men who have good military records.

If a soldier's attitude toward the Army serves an ego-defensive function, a completely different approach is needed to change the attitude. In general, since these attitudes perform an *unconscious* function, they are difficult to modify. One approach is to assist the individual in understanding the function the attitude serves for him—that is, he can be informed through education about unconscious motives and how they are served by certain attitudes. Thus, through such an approach, once a soldier understood the basis for his attitude toward the Army, he might be more apt to look at the Army objectively and to base his attitudes on actual experiences.

Another approach to changing ego-defensive attitudes is therapeutic in nature—using psychotherapy to help a soldier understand the specific base for his attitudes, so that he may be better able to formulate attitudes objectively. Although this approach—or, perhaps, group therapy or encounter groups—is likely to be more effective than the educational approach previously described, it would also be much more expensive, would require much more time, and is not generally appropriate for large-scale application.

If a negative attitude toward the Army served a value-expressive function for a soldier, change might be approached by helping him question his self-concept. If the soldier becomes convinced that his self-image is inappropriate and that a more appropriate identity could be substituted for his old one, then his negative attitude may be changed. It may be that this approach would be effective if the soldier had some preexisting dissatisfaction with himself, and thus would be more susceptible to this sort of influence. Attempts could be made to persuade him to adopt a new self-image in which he would have a more favorable attitude toward the Army.

If a soldier's attitudes toward the Army serve a knowledge function, they can be modified by supplying new information. Thus, if the soldier holds preexisting negative attitudes toward the Army, he can be supplied with information that shows the importance of the Army or of his service in the Army. If the soldier has preexisting positive attitudes, this information should act to strengthen these attitudes.

Although functional theory has the advantage of suggesting the best method for changing attitudes in each person, practical considerations make this individualized approach difficult to administer. In a group as large as the Army, it would be extremely difficult to identify the function of each soldier's attitude toward the Army. Even before it could be attempted, it would be necessary to develop adequate methodologies to obtain such information; since the functions frequently are not at the conscious level, they might be extremely difficult to identify. Even if the functions could be identified, it would then be necessary to institute many different programs to try to change the attitudes of soldiers for whom these attitudes serve different functions, or combinations of functions. Because of the great difficulties involved both in identifying the functions and in developing corresponding attitude change programs, the utilization of functional theory for attitude change is not judged to be practical on any broad basis. However, these concepts might offer a useful approach in individual situations.

CONCLUSIONS

This review of dissonance theory and Katz's functional theory of attitude shows that many difficulties would have to be overcome before these theories could be applied in a practical setting. For example, the application of dissonance theory would require that methods be established to induce soldiers to voluntarily perform acts consistent with having a favorable attitude toward the Army. It would also necessitate the development of procedures to ensure that dissonance would be reduced by attitude change rather than by some other method. Although procedures for inducing dissonance have been developed in the laboratory, little has been done to develop methods for ensuring that this behavior would be reduced by attitude change.

Functional theory offers the advantage of suggesting which method of attitude change would be most effective for each individual soldier, since the same attitude can serve different functions in different people. By identifying the function, the best method to change the attitude of each soldier could be selected. Before the theory could be applied, however, it would be necessary to develop and evaluate procedures to quickly identify the function served by each soldier's attitude toward the Army, before problems of implementation could even be considered.

Thus, both dissonance theory and functional theory offer promise as a basis for suggesting strategies for attitude change approaches; however, further research in development and evaluation would be needed before these methods could be effectively applied. There are, of course, other techniques that can be used to improve the attitude of the soldier. For example, research in the area of persuasion has indicated that attitudes can be changed, to some extent, through direct attempts.

Primarily, of course, attitudes can be changed by changing the Army itself, as was done for Project VOLAR. That method is the most ethical way to help the soldier improve his attitude toward the Army. An attitude is a personal right to which the soldier, like any other citizen, is entitled. Attempts to change attitudes by the use of the indirect methods suggested by attitude theory might be considered by many to infringe upon the personal rights of the soldier. Although direct attempts at persuasion may be more acceptable than indirect attempts, the most ethical technique to use in improving the attitude of the soldier would be to continue to improve the Army itself.

REFERENCES
AND
APPENDICES

REFERENCES

1. Drucker, Eugene H. *A Longitudinal Investigation of Attitude Change and Alienation During Basic Combat Training*, HumRRO Technical Report 74-15, June 1974.
2. Drucker, Eugene H. *The Effects of Basic Combat Training on the Attitudes of the Soldier*, HumRRO Technical Report 74-17, June 1974.
3. Drucker, Eugene H. and Schwartz, Shepard. *Reenlistment Intentions of Tank Commanders*, HumRRO Technical Report 72-17, May 1972.
4. Dillehay, Ronald C. and Jernigan, Larry R. "The Biased Questionnaire as an Instrument of Opinion Change," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, vol. 15, 1970, pp. 144-155.
5. War Department, Army Service Forces, Information and Education Division. *Comparative Morale Attitudes of Men in Army Service Forces in Continental United States*, Report C-124, Washington, D.C., July 1945.
6. War Department General Staff, Information and Education Division, Troop Attitude Research Branch. *Morale Attitudes: I. Trends in Morale Attitudes Among Enlisted Men During 1946*, Report No. 20-309, Washington, D.C., April 1947.
7. U.S. Army Special Staff, Troop Information and Education Division, Troop Attitude Research Branch. *Trends in Morale Attitudes of Soldiers*, Report No. 71-302, Washington, D.C., June 1948.
8. U.S. Army Special Staff, Troop Information and Education Division, Troop Attitude Research Branch. *Trends in Morale Attitudes of Soldiers*, Report No. 99, Washington, D.C., August 1949.
9. U.S. Army Special Staff, Troop Information and Education Division, Troop Attitude Research Branch. *Morale Attitudes of Trainees: A Comparison Between the UMT Experimental Division and Two Conventional Training Divisions*, Report No. 72-312 III T2, Washington, D.C., June 1948.
10. Office of the Secretary of Defense, Armed Forces Information and Education Division, Attitude Research Branch. *New Soldiers' Attitudes - After Six Weeks of Training: 2. Reactions to Training*, Report No. 115-338-II, Washington, D.C., May 1951.
11. U.S. Army Special Staff, Army-Air Force Troop Information and Education Division, Troop Attitude Research Branch. *Attitudes of 18-Year-Old Army Recruits at the Beginning and End of Basic Training*, Report 84-320, Washington, D.C., October 1948.
12. U.S. Army Special Staff, Army-Air Force Troop Information and Education Division, Troop Attitude Research Branch. *Long-Term and Short-Term Recruits in the Army: Differences in Attitudes at the Beginning of Basic Training*, Report No. 88, Washington, D.C., January 1949.
13. Office of the Secretary of Defense, Armed Forces Information and Education Division, Attitude Research Branch. *New Soldier Attitudes - After Six Weeks of Training: 2. Trends in Adjustment and Orientation*, Report No. 114-338-1, Washington, D.C., March 1951.

14. Smith, Brewster B., Bruner, Jerome S., and White, Robert W. *Opinions and Personality*, John Wiley and Sons, Inc., New York, 1956.

15. Katz, Daniel. "The Functional Approach to the Study of Attitudes," *Public Opinion Quarterly*, vol. 24, 1960, pp. 163-204.

16. Kelman, Herbert. "Processes of Opinion Change," *Public Opinion Quarterly*, vol. 25, 1961, pp. 57-78.

17. Hovland, Carl I., Janis, Irving L., and Kelley, Harold H. *Communication and Persuasion*, Yale University Press, New Haven, Conn., 1953.

18. Doob, Leonard W. "The Behavior of Attitudes," *Psychological Review*, vol. 54, 1947, pp. 135-156.

19. Lott, Albert J. and Lott, Bernice E. "A Learning Theory Approach to Interpersonal Attitudes," in A.G. Greedwald, T.C. Brock, and T.M. Ostrom (eds.), *Psychological Foundations of Attitudes*, Academic Press, New York, 1968, pp. 67-88.

20. Asch, Solomon E. *Social Psychology*, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1952.

21. Sherif, Muzafer and Sherif, Carolyn W. *An Outline of Social Psychology*, Harper, New York, 1956.

22. Heider, Fritz. "Attitudes and Cognitive Organization," *Journal of Psychology*, vol. 21, 1946, pp. 107-112.

23. Abelson, Robert P. and Rosenberg, Milton J. "Symbolic Psycho-logic: A Model of Attitudinal Cognition," *Behavioral Science*, vol. 3, 1958, pp. 1-13.

24. Festinger, Leon. *A Theory of Cognitive Dissonance*, Stanford University Press, Stanford, California, 1957.

25. Brehm, Jack W. and Cohen, Arthur R. *Explorations in Cognitive Dissonance*, John Wiley and Sons, Inc., New York, 1962.

Appendix A

TROOP ATTITUDE RESEARCH BRANCH ATTITUDE ITEMS USED IN 1970 AND 1971 HumRRO SURVEYS

In order to be prepared for war, the United States must have not only the most modern weapons, but also a large number of well-trained men. (11)

A. Agree strongly
B. Agree
C. Undecided
D. Disagree
E. Disagree strongly

How good is the medical attention given the men in this unit? (9, 11)

A. Very good
B. Fairly good
C. Not so good
D. Not good at all

If you were offered an honorable discharge today, would you take it? (6, 7, 8)

A. No
B. I'd take it only if I could get a job
C. I'm not sure what I would do
D. I'd take it if I could get any kind of a job
E. I'd take it no matter what

Do you feel that you are trained and ready for combat or do you need more training? (10)

A. I'm ready for combat now
B. I need a little more training
C. I need a lot more training

Do you think you will learn any skills or trades in the Army which you will be able to use in the civilian work you expect to do? (11, 12)

A. Yes
B. No
C. Not sure

During training and drill periods, do you have to spend too much time waiting around and doing nothing? (10)

A. Yes, every day
B. Yes, quite often
C. No, not often
D. No, never
E. Undecided

Do you think when you are discharged you will go back to civilian life with a favorable or unfavorable attitude toward the Army? (9)

A. Very favorable
B. Fairly favorable
C. About fifty-fifty
D. Fairly unfavorable
E. Very unfavorable

Are you ever worried and upset? (6, 7, 8)

A. I am hardly ever worried and upset
B. I am sometimes worried and upset
C. I am often worried and upset

Do you feel that the noncoms in the cadre in charge of your work really know their stuff? (9)

A. All of them do
B. Most of them do
C. About half of them do
D. Few of them do
E. None of them do

Do you feel that your officers are interested in your welfare and personal problems? (6, 7, 8, 9)

A. They have a great deal of interest
B. They have a fair amount of interest
C. They don't have much interest
D. They have no interest at all

Do you feel that there might be anything good to say about Communism? (13)

A. Nothing at all
B. Very little
C. Some good
D. Much good

Every able-bodied man in the United States owes it to his country to take military or naval training so that he can protect his country in an emergency. (11)

A. I agree
B. I disagree
C. I have no opinion

How important is it to you personally to make a good record in the Army? (6)

A. It is very important
B. It is fairly important
C. It is not so important
D. It is not important at all

How good are the mess and food facilities in this unit? (9, 11)

A. Very good
B. Fairly good
C. Not so good
D. Not good at all

How do you feel about the physical training and hardening program? (10)

A. It's too easy
B. It's about right
C. It's too tough

How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with your present Army job? (5)

A. Very dissatisfied
B. Dissatisfied
C. Undecided
D. Satisfied
E. Very satisfied

Do you expect to learn anything in the Army which will be of use to you in civilian life? (11)

A. Yes, a lot
B. Yes, a little
C. No

On the whole, how is the morale in your company or detachment? (5)

A. Very low
B. Low
C. Just so-so
D. High
E. Very high

Do you feel that the officers who are in charge of your work really know their stuff? (9)

A. All of them do
B. Most of them do
C. About half of them do
D. Few of them do
E. None of them do

Do you think the Army has done everything it could to provide interesting and entertaining things for the men in this unit to do in their off-duty free time? (9, 11)

A. Yes
B. No

How serious do you think the present international situation is? (11, 12)

A. Very serious
B. Fairly serious
C. Not so serious
D. Not serious at all

Do you think that some of the training you have been getting is not needed to make men good soldiers? (10)

A. Much of it is not needed
B. Some of it is not needed
C. All of it is needed

Do you think you have a better chance, the same chance, or a worse chance for a job in civilian life than someone who did not have any military service? (11, 12)

A. Better chance than someone sho did not have any military service
B. Same chance
C. Worse chance than someone who did not have military service

What is your opinion of Army rules and regulations? (9)

A. All of them are necessary
B. Most of them are necessary
C. Only a few of them are necessary
D. None of them are necessary

In general, how would you say you feel most of the time, in good spirits or in low spirits? (6, 7, 8)

A. I am usually in good spirits
B. I am in good spirits some of the time and in low spirits some of the time
C. I am usually in low spirits

How successful are your officers in getting willing and wholehearted cooperation from their men? (5, 6, 7, 8, 9)

A. Very successful
B. Fairly successful
C. Not very successful
D. Unsuccessful

If the United States is prepared for war, other countries will probably not attack us. (11)

A. I agree
B. I disagree
C. I have no opinion

Does the Army job you have give you a chance to use your skill and experience? (5)

A. No chance at all
B. Not much of a chance
C. Undecided
D. Fairly good chance
E. Very good chance

In general, how do you like the Army? (9)

A. I like it alright (sic)
B. It's not so bad
C. I just don't like the Army

When the officers you work for give you something to do, do they tell you enough about it so that you can do a good job? (9)

A. Always tell me enough
B. Usually tell me enough
C. Often do not tell me enough
D. Almost never tell me enough

Do you ever have doubts that the United States needs a strong military force? (11, 12)

A. I never have any doubts
B. I sometimes have doubts
C. I often have doubts

What do you think of the military control and discipline in this unit? (9)

A. It is too strict
B. It is about right
C. It is not strict enough

Do you feel that what you will be doing in the Army will be worthwhile or not? (13)

A. I am certain it will be worthwhile
B. I think it will be worthwhile
C. I don't think it will be worthwhile
D. I am certain it won't be worthwhile

From what you have seen or heard, do you think you will get a square deal in the Army? (13)

A. I am sure I will
B. I think I will
C. I don't think I will
D. I am sure I will not

Appendix B

ITEMS FOR DETECTING ATTITUDE CHANGE AMONG SOLDIERS ON ISSUES OF POTENTIAL FUTURE IMPORTANCE

Every soldier should have the right to speak out against the Army, even in public.

A. Agree strongly
B. Agree
C. Undecided
D. Disagree
E. Disagree strongly

Promotions in the Army should be based on the results of elections held within each unit.

A. Agree strongly
B. Agree
C. Undecided
D. Disagree
E. Disagree strongly

Enlisted men should be able to join unions, just like factory workers do.

A. Agree strongly
B. Agree
C. Undecided
D. Disagree
E. Disagree strongly

A soldier should have the right to disobey any order that he feels is immoral, even in a combat situation.

A. Agree strongly
B. Agree
C. Undecided
D. Disagree
E. Disagree strongly

A soldier should not be required to go into combat if he believes that the war is unjust.

A. Agree strongly
B. Agree
C. Undecided
D. Disagree
E. Disagree strongly

Enlisted men should no longer be required to address officers as "Sir."

A. Agree strongly
B. Agree
C. Undecided
D. Disagree
E. Disagree strongly

Rather than have a draft, we should have a professional Army made up of volunteers.

A. Agree strongly
B. Agree
C. Undecided
D. Disagree
E. Disagree strongly

Every soldier should have the right to question any order that he feels is unfair.

A. Agree strongly
B. Agree
C. Undecided
D. Disagree
E. Disagree strongly

Enlisted men should no longer be required to salute officers.

A. Agree strongly
B. Agree
C. Undecided
D. Disagree
E. Disagree strongly

Women, as well as men, should be required to serve in the Army.

A. Agree strongly
B. Agree
C. Undecided
D. Disagree
E. Disagree strongly

Any soldier in a combat zone who intentionally kills innocent civilians should be treated the same as a criminal.

A. Agree strongly
B. Agree
C. Undecided
D. Disagree
E. Disagree strongly

Underground newspapers, coffee houses, and other means of dissent should be allowed on this post.

A. Agree strongly
B. Agree
C. Undecided
D. Disagree
E. Disagree strongly

Appendix C

ITEMS DEALING WITH THE SOLDIER'S CONCERN WITH COMBAT, INJURY, AND DEATH

During your last week as a civilian, how worried were you about the possibility of going into combat?

A. Not worried at all
B. Slightly worried
C. Moderately worried
D. Extremely worried

During your last week as a civilian, how worried were you about the possibility of getting killed or wounded in the Army?

A. Not worried at all
B. Slightly worried
C. Moderately worried
D. Extremely worried

During basic training, did you ever think about what it would be like to kill another human being?

A. No
B. Once in a while
C. Fairly often
D. Very often
E. Almost always

During basic training, did you ever worry about getting killed in combat?

A. No
B. Once in a while
C. Fairly often
D. Very often
E. Almost always

During basic training, did you ever worry about receiving a painful wound in combat?

A. Never
B. Once in a while
C. Fairly often
D. Very often
E. Almost always

How did you feel when you saw combat first-aid films?

A. I enjoyed them very much
B. I enjoyed them a little
C. I didn't enjoy them at all
D. I felt disgusted

During basic training, did you ever worry about being sent into combat?

A. Never
B. Once in a while
C. Fairly often
D. Very often
E. Almost always

If you were sent into combat today, how hard would it be for you to kill an enemy soldier?

A. Very easy
B. Somewhat easy
C. Somewhat hard
D. Very hard

How do you feel about going into combat?

A. I am looking forward to it very much
B. I am looking forward to it a little
C. I am not looking forward to it at all
D. I dread it

How did you feel about learning to kill in the Army?

A. I enjoyed it very much
B. I enjoyed it a little
C. I disliked it a little
D. I disliked it very much

DISTRIBUTION LIST

1 LIB USA AD SCH FT BLISS
1 LIB USA ARMOR SCH FT KNOX
1 LIB USA AVN SCH FT RUCKER
1 LIB USA CHAPLAIN SCH FT WADSWORTH
1 LIB USA CBT SURVEILLANCE & EW SCH FT HUACHUCA
1 LIB USA C & GS COLL FT LEAVENWORTH
1 LIB USA ENGNR SCH FT BELVOIR
1 LIB USA FLD ARTY SCH FT SILL
1 LIB USA FINANCE SCH FT HARRISON
1 LIB USA INF SCH FT BENNING
1 LIB USA INTELL SCH FT HUACHUCA
1 LIB USA MIL POL SCH FT MCCLELLAN
1 LIB USA ORD SCH APG MD
1 LIB USA QM SCH FT LEE
1 LIB USA SIG SCH FT MONMOUTH
1 LIB USA SE SIG SCH FT GORDON
1 LIB USA TRANS SCH FT EUSTIS
1 LIB US WAC SCH FT MCCLELLAN
1 LIB USA WAR COLL CARLISLE BARRACKS
1 LIB WEST POINT MIL ACAD NY
1 LIB USA MED FLD SERV SCH FT HOUSTON
1 CG USA AD CTR ATTN DPT FT BLISS
1 CG USA ARMOR CTR ATTN DPT FT KNOX
1 CG USA FLD ARTY CTR ATTN DPT FT SILL
1 CG USA ENGNR CTR ATTN DPT FT WOOD
1 CG USA INF CTR ATTN DPT FT DIX
1 CG USA TNG CTR ATTN DPT FT GORDON
1 CG USA TNG CTR ATTN DPT FT JACKSON
1 CG USA TNG CTR ATTN DPT FT LEWIS
1 CG USA TNG CTR ATTN DPT FT ORD
1 CG USA MED TNG CTR ATTN DPT FT HOUSTON
1 CG US WAC CTR ATTN DPT FT MCCLELLAN
1 CG USA TNG CTR ATTN DPT FT CAMPBELL
1 CG USA CDC EXPER COMD FT ORD
1 CO USA AD HRU FT BLISS
1 CO USA ARMOR HRU FT KNOX
1 CO USA AVN HRU FT RUCKER
1 CO USA INF HRU FT BENNING
1 CO USA TNG CTR HRU CALIF
1 DIR PERSNL STUDIES & RSCH ODCSPER DA
1 CG USA TNG CTR ATTN DPT FT POLK
1 CHF OF R & D DA ATTN CHF OF TECH & INDUST LIAISON OFC
1 BSO ARD OFC CHF OF R & D
1 CHF OF R & D DA ATTN SCI INFO BR RSCH SPT DIV
1 DIR ARMY LIB PENTAGON
1 TECH LIB BUR OF SHIPS CODE 210L

15 COMD TRADOC ATTN ATTS ITR
2 COMD TRADOC ATTN LIB
1 STIMSON LIB MED FLD SERV SCH BROOK ARMY MED CTR
1 TECH LIB USACDC EXPER COMD FT ORD
1 OFC OF PERSNL OPS DA PERSNL MGMT DEV OFFICE ATTN MOS SEC
1 EA USA AVN SCH FT RUCKER
1 EA USA CHAPLAIN SCH FT WADSWORTH
1 EA USA CBT SURVEILLANCE & EW SCH FT HUACHUCA
1 EA USA C & GS COLL FT LEAVENWORTH
1 EA USA ENGR SCH FT BELVOIR
1 EA USA FLD ARTY SCH FT SILL
1 EA USA FINANCE SCH FT HARRISON
1 EA USA INF SCH FT BENNING
1 EA USA INTELL SCH FT HUACHUCA
1 EA USA INST FOR ADMIN (PROV) FT HARRISON
1 EA USA AD SCH FT BLISS
1 EA USA ARMOR SCH FT KNOX
1 EA USA SIG SCH FT MONMOUTH
1 EA USA SES SCH FT GORDON
1 EA USA TRANS SCH FT EUSTIS
1 EA US WAC SCH FT MCCLELLAN
1 EA USA WAR COLL CARLISLE BARRACKS
1 EA WEST POINT MIL ACAD NY
1 EA USA MED FLD SERV SCH FT HOUSTON
1 CO USCG TNG CTR NY
1 CO USCG TNG CTR CAPE MAY NJ
1 EA USA MIL POL SCH FT MCCLELLAN
1 EA USA ORD SCH APG MD
1 EA USA QM SCH FT LEE
1 DIR OF MIL PSYCH US MIL ACAD NY
1 DOI US MIL ACAD NY
1 DIR OF MIL INSTRUCTION US MIL ACAD NY
1 DIR PERSNL RSCH DIV BUR OF NAVL PERSNL
1 DIR MARINE CORPS INST ATTN EVAL UNIT WASH DC
1 DIR PERSNL RECH LAB NAVL PERSNL PROG SUPT ACT WNY
1 CHF OF NAVL RES PERSNL & TNG BR (CODE 458)
12 ADMIN DDC CAMERON STA
1 DIR USA MANPOWER RES RSCH & DEV CTR
1 CBT ARMS TNG BD FT BENNING
1 AFHRL MANPOWER DEV ATTN COL RATLIFFE
1 DIR AIR UNIV LIB ATTN AUL3T-253
1 DIR MARINE CORPS EDUC CTR QUANTICO
1 RSCH CONTRACTS & GRANTS BR ARD
1 DEPT OF THE AF DEPT OF LIFE & BEHAV SCI ATTN DIR
1 CO AFHRL (AFSC)ATTN DOJ2 BROOKS AFB
1 CO HRL BROOKS AFB

HUMAN RESOURCES RESEARCH ORGANIZATION

300 North Washington Street • Alexandria, Virginia 22314

President	Dr. Meredith P. Crawford
Executive Vice President	Dr. William A. McClelland
Executive Officer	Mr. Saul Lavisky
Director for Business Affairs & Treasurer	Mr. Charles W. Smith
Director for Program Development	Mr. David S. Bushnell
Director for Research Design & Reporting	Dr. Eugene A. Cogan
Director Editorial & Production Center	Mrs. Lola M. Zook

RESEARCH DIVISIONS

HumRRO Eastern Division 300 North Washington Street Alexandria, Virginia 22314	Dr. J. Daniel Lyons Director
HumRRO Division No. 2 Fort Knox, Kentucky 40121	Dr. Donald F. Haggard Director
HumRRO Western Division Post Office Box 5787 Presidio of Monterey, California 93940	Dr. Howard H. McFann Director
HumRRO Division No. 4 Post Office Box 2086 Fort Benning, Georgia 31905	Dr. T.O. Jacobs Director
HumRRO Division No. 6 Post Office Box 428 Fort Rucker, Alabama 36360	Dr. Wallace W. Prophet Director